

Appln No. 09/525,505
Amdt dat August 22, 2003
Reply to Office action of May 28, 2003

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-10, 15, 16 and 18-20 are pending in this application, of which claims 1, 2, and 15 are independent. Claims 1, 2 and 15 have been amended. The amendments add no new matter and find full support in the application as originally filed. In view of the above amendments and following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and a timely indication of allowance.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-10, 15-16 and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang (U.S. Patent No. 5,595,519) in view of O'Boyle (U.S. Patent No. 5,708,327). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Claims 1, 2 and 15 are each directed to a field emission display having an electron emission member with "a longitudinal dimension and an aspect ratio greater than one." When the longitudinal dimension of the electron emission member has an aspect ratio that is greater than one, a broad area emitter is formed. In a broad area emitter, electrons are emitted from the end portion of the electron emission member. Furthermore, the emitter of claims 1,2 and 15 comprises an alignment member for aligning the electron emission member relative to the cathode.

Both Huang and O'Boyle, disclose "emitter tips" having a cone shape. Each "emitter tip" emits electrons from their sharp tips. The ferromagnetic material of O'Boyle is not used to align an electron mission member relative to the cathode. Rather the ferromagnetic material of O'Boyle forms a permanent

Appln No. 09/525,505

Amdt date August 22, 2003

Reply to Office action of May 28, 2003

magnet that produces a magnetic field in a region external to the emitter tip for focusing electrons emitted from the tip. Nowhere does O'Boyle disclose aligning the electron emission member by use of the ferromagnetic material. As such, O'Boyle and Huang do not disclose, teach or suggest each of the elements of claims 1, 2 or 15.

Consequently, O'Boyle and Huang renders neither claim 1, 2 nor 15 obvious. Claims 3, 4, 7, 8 and 18 depend from claim 1. Claims 5, 6, 9, 10 and 19 depend from claim 2. Claims 16 and 20 depend from claim 15. Claims 1, 2 and 15 are now believed to be in condition for allowance over O'Boyle and Huang. As such, Applicant submits that claims 3-10, 16 and 18-20 are also allowable over O'Boyle and Huang as being dependent from an allowable base claim and for the additional limitations they contain therein. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1-10, 15-16 and 18-20 over O'Boyle and Huang under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

In view of the above amendment and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-10, 15, 16 and 18-20 are in condition for allowance, and a timely indication of allowance is respectfully requested. If there are any remaining issues that can be addressed by telephone, Applicant invites the Examiner to

Appln No. 09/525,505


Amdt date August 22, 2003

R ply to Offic action of May 28, 2003

contact the undersigned at the number indicated.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP

By 
Rodney W. Warfford
Reg. No. 51,304
626/795-9900

RVW

CLV PAS512679.3--08/22/03 9:50 AM